

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATIONS OF TYPE-SPECIES FOR *ERIOPHYES* SIEBOLD, 1851 AND *PHYTOPTUS* DUJARDIN, 1851 (ACARINA: ERIOPHYOIDEA).

Z.N.(S.) 2044.

(see vol. 30: 196-197, vol. 32: 17-18, 86-94)

- (1) By Evert E. Lindquist (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0C6, Canada*)

This is written in response to the comments by H.H. Keifer, R.A. Newkirk and L.R. Jeppson regarding this case.

The comments by Keifer and Newkirk are unfortunately distorted and provincial in outlook. The goal of the Code is to achieve stability and universality in nomenclature, that is, an *international* common usage. The only acarologists actively supporting the comments of Keifer and Newkirk are some of their own American colleagues. They indicate that they know of no other objections to their 1971 name changes other than those of the Soviet acarologists. Yet, Keifer knew of mine a year ago through personal correspondence when he was seeking support for his views. Far more important, a perusal of the recent eriophyid literature *throughout the world*, except for the United States, shows nearly total lack of adoption of Newkirk and Keifer's 1971 changes in nomenclature. Only a handful of American workers, within the sphere of influence of Keifer and Newkirk, have accepted their changes in publications. Yet they "presume 'wholehearted support'".

Keifer and Newkirk rest their case heavily on "following the provisions of the Code". But the problem was created by Keifer's *not* following the Code for over 30 years, and then abruptly making changes instead of drafting a proposal for *international* consideration by the Commission.

Keifer and Newkirk refer to having consulted about this problem with "other interested zoologists", who remain unnamed. It seems unlikely that any of these zoologists were eriophyid specialists outside the United States. It would have been preferable to seek a consensus from leading specialists of the world, and then to draft a proposal to the Commission. Also, they justify their action in part on "needless and numerous exceptions" not serving the stability and universality of nomenclature. However, this case is concerned with neither "needless" nor "numerous" exceptions. The justification for occasional, carefully-considered exceptions, for the sake of maintaining international common usage, has been well expressed recently by Menke and Bohart (1975 *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 32: 97-98) in another, unrelated case currently up for consideration by the Commission; such cases are by no means precedent-setting, but instead are reasonable solutions to special taxonomic problems.

Keifer and Newkirk's citing of an action taken by Nalepa in 1878 is hardly to be taken seriously. There was little literature (other than Nalepa's) on the ERIOPHYIDAE in Nalepa's day, and he was the dominant force among a few specialists. Today, there is a relatively vast, international compilation of literature on this group, and there are a number of leading specialists throughout the world, none of whom are dominated by another.

Keifer and Newkirk's arguments — (a) that only a few, rather than many, species of ERIOPHYIDAE are of great economic importance; (b) that the species with changed binominals are still recognized by their E.S.A.-approved vernacular names in the applied economic literature; and (c) that the U.S. EPA list uses the changed binominals — show a lack of understanding of the world literature on this group. There are many eriophyid species of economic importance throughout the world, the majority of which do not have American-approved vernacular names (what would such names mean to German, Indian, Brazilian, Russian, etc. workers?), and are not accounted for by the U.S. EPA list. To suggest that, because the E.S.A. has world-wide membership, its approved vernacular names and binominals have world-wide acceptance, is therefore misleading and somewhat presumptuous.

Finally, a response to Dr. Lee R. Jeppson's note in support of Newkirk and Keifer's 1971

changes. He advocates adhering to established rules in the Code, and refers to a new book on plant-feeding mites, jointly-authored by him, which is purported to be world-wide in scope and employs the changed binomials for eriophyid mites. Yet, in this very book, he persists with Keifer (another of the authors) in *not* following the Code regarding family-group names! Also, the book is not as comprehensive for the economically important eriophyids which do not occur in North America as for those that do.

This case is not merely one of divergence of usage between Russian and American specialists, as the comments on it unfortunately suggest. If the recent eriophyid literature from other countries and in other languages is considered, it will be found that Newkirk and Keifer's changes are followed in very few taxonomic or applied papers.

(2) By Dr. D.C.M. Manson, (*Department of Agriculture, Plant Health and Diagnostic Station
P.O. Box 241, Levin, New Zealand*)

Having seen Evert E. Lindquist's comments on this name change (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 32: 17-18) I would like to say I fully agree with his proposals, and support the retention of the usage of the generic names *Eriophyes*, *Phytoptus* and *Aceria* as known prior to Newkirk and Keifer's 1971 paper.

Lindquist's proposals are logical and common sense ones, whereas although Newkirk and Keifer may be "legally" correct, the introduction at this stage of new definitions for *Eriophyes*, *Phytoptus* and *Aceria*, all standard and well recognized genera, would create considerable confusion to both students and specialists alike.

(3) By Magdalena K.P. Smith Meyer (*Plant Protection Research Institute, Pretoria,
South Africa*)

Newkirk & Keifer (1971) published an article containing changes in the nomenclature of some eriophyid species. Shevtchenko (1974) and Lindquist (1975) objected against the changes of the names and the concepts of some of the most important genera and species. They pointed out that the names of many economic important species are subjected to changes and that may lead to confusion among taxonomists and biologists.

Herewith I want to support Shevtchenko's proposal that the previous designations of the type-species of the genera concerned are retained and that the situation is left unchanged as before the publication of Newkirk & Keifer's paper because of the long-established usage of these names.

LITERATURE CITED

- NEWKIRK, R.A. & KEIFER, H.H., 1971. Revision of types of *Eriophyes* and *Phytoptus*. Eriophyid studies, C-5, Agric. Res. Serv., U.S. Dep. Agric. : 1-14.
LINDQUIST, E.E., 1975. Comment on the proposed designations of type-species for *Eriophyes* Siebold, 1851 and *Phytoptus* Dujardin, 1851 (Acarina, Eriophyoidea). Z.N.(S.) 2044. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 32(1): 17-18.

(4) By G.W. Ramsay (*Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Entomology Division,
Mt. Albert Research Centre, Auckland, New Zealand*)

In response to the various petitions and comments by Keifer, Newkirk, Jeppson, Lindquist, Shevtchenko, Sukhareva and Sapozhnikova concerning the proposed changes with the names of three eriophyid mite genera (published not only in this *Bulletin*, but also in *Canadian Entomologist* vol. 106: 209-212, 1974) I write to support the case developed by Lindquist and Shevtchenko against the proposed changes.

The three names concerned, *Aceria*, *Eriophyes* and *Phytoptus* are widely used and involve species of economic importance as shown by Shevtchenko (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 32(2): 91-94, 1975). He lists numerous and important scientific publications in which these generic names have been used in their established sense during the past decade. The